Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 5 1957
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. 642

THE CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, THE OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY, THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, and THE CITY OF LANCASTER, OHIO,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

WALTER E. BECKJORD, of
PECK, SHAFFER & WILLIAMS,
1602 First National Bank Bldg.,
Cincinnati, Ohio,

RICHARD H. RHEIN,
4th & Main Streets,
Cincinnati, Ohio,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

THE JOHNSON & HARDIN CO., LAW PRINTERS
CINCINNATI, OHIO

SUBJECT INDEX

	PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
STATUTES INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF CASE	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	9
1. The Court of Appeals Cannot, by Deciding Under Sec. 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act that Petitioner Is Not Aggrieved by the Order of the Commission, Avoid Consideration of Petitioner's Claim that the Commission Did Not Comply with the Administrative Procedure Act and Procedural Due Process	9
i. THE COMMISSION DID NOT ANSWER PETITIONER'S CONTENTIONS ON MARKET STREET RAILWAY AND MOBILE AND SIERRA PACIFIC	10
ii. THE COURT OF APPEALS IS IN ERROR IN NOT CONSIDERING THE CONTENTION THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT AND DUE PROCESS WERE NOT COMPLIED WITH	11
iii. A PUBLIC QUESTION IS INVOLVED	14
2. The Court of Appeals Was in Error (a) in Deciding that Petitioner Was Not Aggrieved by the Commission's Order and (b) in Failing to Decide that Petitioner's Three Substantive Claims Were Well Taken	14
i. "MARKET STREET RAILWAY" REQUIRES DISAPPROVAL OF THE LONG TERM COMMITMENT	15
ii. THE GAS SERVICE AGREEMENT PRECLUDES A LONG TERM COMMITMENT UNDER MOBILE AND SIERRA PACIFIC	16

PAGE

iii. The Unlawful Extension of the Long Term Commitment to the Electric Business 18

iv. A Public Question Is Involved 19

CONCLUSION 20

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 21

APPENDIX 1a

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Judicial Decisions

Colorado Interstate Gas Co. v. *Federal Power Commission* ~~(1919), 225 N. Y. 89, 121 N. E. 772~~ 324 U.S. 581 18

Federal Power Commission v. *Hope Natural Gas Company* (1943), 320 U. S. 591 ..... 12, 16

Market St. Railway Co. v. *R. R. Comm. of Cal.*, 324 U. S. 548 ..... 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20

Sierra Pacific Power Co. v. *F. P. C.*, 350 U. S. 348 ..... 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18

United Gas Pipeline Company v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U. S. 332 ..... 7, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17

Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division v. *Federal Power Commission*, — U. S. App. D. C. —, — F. (2d) —. (Decided November 21, 1957) 8, 17, 20

Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act—

(Act of June 11, 1946, Ch. 324, Sec. 7, 60 Stat. 241) 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13

Natural Gas Act—

Act of June 21, 1938, c. 556, 52 Stat. 821-833; Title 15 U. S. C., Sections 717-717w .....

Act of February 7, 1942, c. 49, 56 Stat. 83-84; Title 15 U. S. C., Section 717f

PAGE

Act of July 25, 1947, c. 333, 61 Stat. 459; Title 15 U. S. C. Section 717f(h)

Act of March 27, 1954, c. 115, 68 Stat. 36; Title 15 U. S. C., Section 717c

Sec. 4 2, 8

Sec. 5 2

Sec. 19(b) 2, 5, 9, 13

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. ————

THE CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, THE OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY, THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, and THE CITY OF LANCASTER, OHIO,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

---

To the Honorable the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The Petitioner, The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the Judgment of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirming an order of the Federal Power Commission.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion and Order of the Federal Power Commission (R. 1123) is reported as *The Ohio Fuel Gas Company,* 15 F. P. C. 1623; 14 P. U. R. (3d) 266. Its Findings and

Order Denying Applications for Rehearing, etc. is at R. 1161. The opinion of the Court of Appeals (R. 1224) is reported as *The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company* v. *F. P. C.*, 247 F. (2d) 556, and merely states that the Petition for Review was dismissed for the reasons set forth in the opinion in *The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, et al.* v. *F. P. C.*, 246 F. (2d) 688. The pertinent parts of the Commission orders and the opinions of the Court of Appeals are appended to this Petition.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals sought to be reviewed was entered June 20, 1957 (R. 1226). Petition for Rehearing was seasonably filed by Petitioner and was denied on September 9, 1957 (R. 1231). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 15 U. S. C. Sec. 717r(b) and 28 U. S. C. Sec. 1254 (1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Court of Appeals can, by deciding under Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, that Petitioner is not aggrieved by an Order of the Federal Power Commission, avoid consideration of Petitioner's claim that the Commission did not comply with the Administrative Procedure Act and procedural due process?

2. Whether the Court of Appeals is in error (a) in deciding that Petitioner was not aggrieved by the Commission's order in respect of (i), (ii) or (iii) below and (b) in failing to decide that

> (i) The Commission's Order unlawfully seeks to assure to one of Petitioner's natural gas suppliers minimum demand revenues from Petitioner over a long term even though the gas requirements of Petitioner might substantially decrease due to loss of business to competitive fuels and technologies, in violation of

Sec. 4 (and 5) of the Natural Gas Act and substantive due process,

(ii) The Commission's Order unlawfully approves the imposition by Petitioner's said supplier of the long term billing commitment for minimum demand revenues, contrary to the existing Gas Service Agreement between Petitioner and Supplier and without the necessary consent of Petitioner or finding that said Agreement adversely affects the public interest under the Natural Gas Act, and/or

(iii) The Commission's Order unlawfully approves the extension of the long term commitment for demand revenues to the revenues and assets of the electric operations of Petitioner contrary to Section 4 (and 5) of the Natural Gas Act and substantive due process.

STATUTES INVOLVED

Sec. 4 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. Sec. 717c), the principal section involved reads in part as follows:

> "Sec. 4. (a) All rates and charges made, demanded or received by any natural-gas company for or in connection with the transportation or sale of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission . . . shall be just and reasonable, and any such rate or charge that is not just and reasonable is hereby declared to be unlawful."

The requirement of Sec. 5 of said Act that rates shall be "just and reasonable" is comparable.

Sec. 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. Sec. 717r[b]), insofar as pertinent, reads as follows:

> "(b) Any party to a proceeding under this Act aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in such proceeding may obtain a review of such order . . . in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court, within sixty days after the order of the Commission upon the application

for rehearing, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. . . ."

Sec. 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. Sec. 1007[b]), insofar as pertinent, reads as follows:

"(b) Prior to each . . . decision upon agency review of the decision of subordinate officers the parties shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to submit for the consideration of the officers participating in such decisions (1) proposed findings and conclusions, or (2) exceptions to the decisions . . . of subordinate officers . . . and (3) supporting reasons for such exceptions or proposed findings or conclusions. The record shall show the ruling upon each such finding, conclusion, or exception presented. All decisions . . . shall become a part of the record and include a statement of (1) findings and conclusions, as well as the reasons or basis therefor, upon all the material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record; and (2) the appropriate rule, order, sanction, relief, or denial thereof."

Section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1009), insofar as pertinent, reads as follows:

"Except so far as (1) statutes preclude judicial review or (2) agency action is by law committed to agency discretion——

(a) *Right of Review.* Any person suffering legal wrong because of any agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by such action within the meaning of any relevant statute, shall be entitled to judicial review thereof.

(b) *Form and venue of proceedings.* The form of proceedings for judicial review shall be any special statutory review proceeding relevant to the subject matter in any court specified by statute. . . .

(c) *Acts reviewable.* Every agency action made reviewable by statute and every final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in any court shall be subject to judicial review. . . .

(e) *Scope of Review.* So far as necessary to decision and where presented the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any agency action. It shall (A) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and (B) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be (1) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (2) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (3) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; (4) without observance of procedure required by law; . . . In making the foregoing determinations the court shall review the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error."

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution reads in part:

". . . nor shall any person . . . be deprived of . . . property, without due process of law. . . ."

STATEMENT OF CASE

This case involves the affirmance by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit of an order issued by the Federal Power Commission (the "Commission") on June 29, 1956, approving, among other things, the long term billing commitment feature of the Contract Demand rate form proposed by Ohio Fuel Gas Company ("Ohio Fuel") in a filing under the Natural Gas Act. The jurisdiction of that Court was invoked under Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act and errors were asserted as to the failure of the

Commission to comply with Sec. 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act and procedural due process, as well as to certain substantive matters.

Petitioner is a gas distributor and serves the area in and around Cincinnati, Ohio. It also distributes electricity in its service area. Ohio Fuel, an intervenor-respondent below, is a subsidiary of the Columbia Gas System, Inc., and makes interstate sales to a number of companies in Ohio, including Petitioner, subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

On September 18, 1953, Ohio Fuel filed a new Gas Tariff with the Commission through resort to the notice procedure of Sec. 4 of the Act (R. 573). This rate filing, in addition to increasing the level of the rates theretofore being charged, proposed the Contract Demand "rate form," involving the substitution of a long term (usually twenty years) commitment to pay demand charges for the one year commitment under the prior rate form and Gas Service Agreement.

"Rate form" refers to the tariff formula by which a customer's monthly bill is determined. Both the Contract Demand and prior rate forms provide for a demand charge and a commodity charge, the demand charge being generally designed to compensate for the capacity available during the billing period and the commodity charge being generally designed to compensate for the use of quantities of gas during the billing period. Demand and commodity rates are applied to the demand and commodity usages of a customer, called billing units. Thus, a monthly bill is arrived at in the following way:

Demand rate (×) billing demand units	= demand charge
Commodity rate (×) commodity billing units	= commodity charge
TOTAL BILL	= Sum of demand and commodity charges

The purpose of the demand formula, the commodity not being in issue, is generally to enable the seller to recover some portion of its fixed or capacity costs, regardless of the daily use. It is especially effective where large seasonal space heating loads are involved.

Under the Contract Demand "rate form" the billing demand units are equal to the greatest single day delivery during the twelve months ending with the billing month, but may not be less than 90% of the Contract Demand or greater than the Contract Demand. From time to time the Contract Demand can be changed with the agreement of both parties; but it cannot be reduced by the Purchaser alone except within fairly narrow limits, i.e., up to two 5% reductions in successive years or a total of 10% through the life of the Service Agreement. The rate form is implemented by requiring purchasers such as Petitioner to enter into long term Service Agreements in lieu of the existing Agreements specifying the Contract Demand.

In the hearings and proceedings before the Commission, Petitioner recommended (R. 1067 et seq.; 1150 et seq.) that the long term commitment feature be deleted, advancing contentions that the risk of loss of markets were ones which Ohio Fuel should bear under *Market St. Railway Co.* v. *R. R. Comm. of Cal.*, 324 U. S. 548. This point is based on the proposition that the business of supplying heat is a competitive one (R. 224-31, 251-55, Ex. No. 45) and that the Commission ought not to approve a rate form which would help perpetuate the existence of an enterprise that might turn out to be uneconomic.

Petitioner also urged (R. 1153 et seq.) that its existing Gas Service Agreement with Ohio Fuel was such that Ohio Fuel could not unilaterally change the length of commitment as to billing demand units absent Petitioner's consent or a finding of adverse affect on the public interest, as required by *United Gas Pipeline Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service*

Corp., 350 U. S. 332 and *Sierra Pacific Power Co.* v. *F. P. C.*, 350 U. S. 348. The existing Gas Service Agreement is a limited requirements agreement covering a supply to Petitioner through April, 1965 (See Item No. GGG, R. 971, 949). Thus, the commitment for supply is a long term one. In contrast, the commitment as to rate schedules, *excepting*, in our opinion, *the General Terms and Conditions*, is for a short term.* That section reads as follows:

> "*Section 5. Applicable Rate Schedules.* Natural gas delivered hereunder shall be paid for under Rate Schedule F-1 or any superseding Rate Schedules of Seller included in the Tariff on file with the Federal Power Commission. This agreement in all respects shall be subject to the applicable provisions of the General Terms and Conditions included in the Tariff on file with the Federal Power Commission which are by reference made a part hereof."

However, Ohio Fuel resorted to Sec. 4 of the Act to change the rate and rate form. In that connection, Petitioner has contended that the provisions for long term commitment as to supply and short term commitment as to rates, do not permit Ohio Fuel to substitute a rate form embodying a long term commitment as to rates as well. Petitioner has also contended that Section 5 of the Agreement fixes the agreed on General Terms and Conditions as the *particular ones* attached to rate schedule F-1 on file with the Commission at the time and not subject to unilateral change through the life of the Agreement. Of course, these do not include a long term *billing* commitment. Significantly, there is no provision for unilateral supersession of the General Terms and Conditions, as in the case of the Rate Schedule because, as Petitioner has contended, they included such important and mutually

---

* Although *Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission, et al.*, U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 13,666, decided November 21, 1957, is to the contrary.

binding provisions as the right to require the seller to meet competitive prices, and arrangements as to supply (R. 963). Nevertheless, Ohio Fuel unilaterally proposed the long term billing commitment through a change in the General Terms and Conditions (R. 595).

Petitioner's third contention was that, if the long term commitment was approved, a provision (R. 1065, 1148) should be included in the Tariff whereby the corporate commitment under the Contract Demand type Service Agreement would not extend to the revenues and assets of Petitioner's electric operations, which had not given rise to the commitment.

Petitioner's fourth contention was that it had not received an answer to its contentions as required under the Administrative Procedure Act (R. 1149).

The Commission issued its Finding and Order on June 29, 1956 (R. 1123) approving the Contract Demand rate form substantially as proposed. It thereby reversed its prior disapproval of that rate form for the same Ohio Fuel Gas Company in its Opinion No. 273.

Upon denial of its application for rehearing (R. 1147, 1161), Petitioner filed a petition for review in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (R. 1215), making the contentions described above. The Court held that Petitioner was not aggrieved, under Sec. 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, for reasons set forth in the companion decision described under "Opinions Below." The Court did not discuss the contentions based on the Administrative Procedure Act and procedural due process.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The Court of Appeals Cannot, by Deciding Under Sec. 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act that Petitioner Is Not Aggrieved by the Order of the Commission, Avoid Consideration of Petitioner's Claim that the Commission Did Not Comply with the Administrative Procedure Act and Procedural Due Process.

As a predicate to consideration of the avoidance of the procedural issues by the Court of Appeals, we shall discuss the way in which the Commission failed to answer two contentions made by Petitioner.

i. The Commission Did Not Answer Petitioner's Contentions on Market Street Railway and Mobile and Sierra Pacific.

The Commission's Order overruling the Applications for Rehearing (R. 1161) reads:

> "We have considered the other contentions raised by the applications for rehearing, including Cincinnati's objection to the long-term billing commitment of the CD rate form (*Market Street Railway, supra*—our note), the effect of the *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific* decisions. . . . We find that they are not sufficiently material to warrant further discussion here, or that they have been fully considered and correctly disposed of in our order issued June 29, 1956, in this proceeding."

Surely, issues presented under *Market Street Railway* and *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific, supra,* are material ones (see point 2 below) requiring discussion and ruling under the Administrative Procedure Act and due process.

The Commission's assertion that the objection to the long term commitment had already been considered and disposed of is based on footnote 4 in the Findings and Order issued June 29, 1956, reading:

> "A CD rate with a short-term commitment, such as a one-year contract, would not provide long-term stability in demand revenues" (R. 1130).

We submit that this statement displays no consideration of the competing principle of *Market Street Railway, supra,* that due process does not "insure values."

As to disposition of *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific, supra,* Petitioner did not directly raise this contention until its Application for Rehearing, so that the Commission must have been referring to its disposition of Dayton Power and Light Company's contention based on those cases in the Findings and Order issued June 29, 1956, as follows:

> "As we show below, continued billing by Ohio Fuel under the average demand basis heretofore used is no longer in the public interest" (R. 1127).

Petitioner has no quarrel with the Commission's finding that the *short term aspects* of the prior rate form were inappropriate. However, the length of the billing commitment could not be unilaterally changed from 12 months to twenty years. The necessary finding that Petitioner's existing Service Agreement was in that respect contrary to the public interest was not made; indeed, Petitioner's Service Agreement was not even discussed.

ii. THE COURT OF APPEALS IS IN ERROR IN NOT CONSIDERING THE CONTENTION THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT AND DUE PROCESS WERE NOT COMPLIED WITH.

Accordingly, Petitioner asserted before the Court of Appeals that it had not received an answer to either of the contentions discussed in i. above, as required by Sec. 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act:

> ". . . The record shall show the ruling upon each such finding, conclusion, or exception presented. All decisions . . . shall become a part of the record and include a statement of (1) findings and conclusions, as well as the reasons or basis therefor, upon all material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record. . . ."

Petitioner also asserted that it had not received procedural due process, namely, "the product of the Commission's expert judgment" as required by *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Company* (1943), 320 U. S. 591.

Nevertheless, the Court of Appeals gave no consideration to either of these contentions. Its opinion (Appendix A hereto) holds that Petitioner is not "aggrieved" by the Commission Order, relying for reasoning on the decision in the companion case, which recites:

> "Their statutory right to review of this order depends upon whether the petitioners actually are aggrieved by the portion of it they desire us to modify, which is the only portion of which they complain. Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, under which the petition for review was filed, provides that any party to a proceeding under the Act aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in such proceeding may obtain a review of such order in this court . . . by seasonably filing a petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part" (Appendix B, p. 7a).

The Court then reviewed each of Petitioner's three substantive grounds of error and came to the conclusion that Petitioner was not aggrieved as to any of the three grounds. At no point did the Court even so much as refer to Petitioner's procedural contentions. In fact, the Court does not refer to any instance where the Commission discussed the *Market Street Railway, supra,* doctrine. It is true it did quote (Appendix B, p. 12a) the Commission's purported findings on *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific, supra,* but, as we have discussed above, whatever the Commission's intention, the findings were inadequate.

The Court's decision was a clear departure from the way the case was presented by Petitioner, the Commission and the intervenor Ohio Fuel. For example, the Com-

mission had asserted in footnote 5 to its Order Denying Application for Rehearing (R. 1161-2) that the Administrative Procedure Act had been complied with. But assertion is not enough.

Because of this departure, Petitioner filed a Petition for Rehearing of the Court's decision specifically claiming error in that respect (R. 1227). That petition was denied without opinion (R. 1231). This represents, we submit, a clear holding that compliance with the "grievance" test of Sec. 19(b) was the only requirement.

The Court was no doubt led into error because the Petition was filed under Sec. 19(b). However, Sec. 10(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act requires that the Petition be so filed:

> "The form of proceeding for judicial review shall be any special statutory review proceeding relevant to the subject matter in any court specified by statute. . . ." (5 U. S. C. Sec. 1009)

This provision surely does not do away with the necessity for compliance with the rest of the Administrative Procedure Act. Thus, subsection (e) of Sec. 10 of that Act requires that the Court shall set aside agency action found to be ". . . (4) without observance of procedure required by law . . . and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error." The procedure which Petitioner claims was not observed is prescribed in Sec. 8(b) of that Act, namely the provisions requiring an answer to material issues and contentions.

That the Commission's failure to give an answer to, and hence evidence consideration of Petitioner's contentions, was prejudicial is graphically illustrated by the fact that the Commission had, in a prior proceeding, disapproved of the Contract Demand rate form. See Commission Opinion No. 273 (unreported). If Petitioner's contentions

had been considered in this proceeding, it is possible that they would have been held well taken.

iii. A Public Question Is Involved.

Thus, at both the commission and judicial levels, Petitioner has been unable to obtain the kind of consideration of its contentions that the law and due process require. Consideration of an issue is the very minimum to which a party is entitled in the administrative process. Though the result in this proceeding is a grievous wrong to Petitioner, the decision is more far reaching.

While the Natural Gas Act provides for hearing and review in general terms, the Administrative Procedure Act outlines the specific procedures required. The proceedings herein illustrate the special importance and meaning of these detailed provisions for the many litigants concerned with administrative procedure.

Through the years, the Court has shown great interest in the protection of the civil liberties of individuals from improper governmental encroachment. It is also of great importance that the administrative determinations of the government in the field of business be arrived at through fair procedures.

2. The Court of Appeals Was in Error (a) in Deciding that Petitioner Was Not Aggrieved by the Commission's Order and (b) in Failing to Decide that Petitioner's Three Substantive Claims Were Well Taken.

The Court of Appeals held that Petitioner was not aggrieved by the order because it found none of its contentions presently well taken. The consequences of that kind of a decision can be far reaching. If the Commission follows such a concept, it can deny intervention so long as it can be sure that the intervenor's contentions are not well taken. Surely such a procedure will not produce the best

administrative results, where the issues are not made up in advance as in civil practice.

Nevertheless, Petitioner urges that the Court erred in failing to remand with disapproval of the long term billing commitment. The involuntary entering upon a long term contractual obligation is in its view a truly onerous and present event in the light of the three concepts which we shall now outline.

i. "Market Street Railway" Requires Disapproval of the Long Term Commitment.

The Commission's approval of the long term billing commitment, affirmed by the Court of Appeals, appears to have resulted from application of its "prudent investment" philosophy of rate making, whereby a utility is entitled to earn on the cost of facilities originally prudently constructed and paid for. However, this Court in *Market Street Railway, supra,* held that the prudent investment theory is not properly used in regulating an industry a portion of whose value has been lost due to economic forces and that substantive due process does not "insure values" or "restore values that have been lost by operation of economic forces."

The Commission justified the long term commitment solely in these words:

> "A CD rate with a short-term commitment, such as a one-year contract, would not provide long-term stability in demand revenues." Findings and Order, footnote 4, R. 1130.

We submit that such a decision is erroneous because it takes no account of the competing principle of *Market Street Railway, supra.*

Petitioner further claims that approval of the long term commitment is unreasonable under the Natural Gas Act,

the primary aim of which is to "protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies" *F. P. C.* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.* (1943), 320 U. S. 591 at 610.

The Court of Appeal's determination that Petitioner is

> "not presently aggrieved by the long term billing commitment of the contract demand component in the approved rate form, merely because drastic economic changes now unforeseeable might occur during the term" (Appendix B, p. 10a).

begs the question that Petitioner is presently required to enter into an agreement, involuntarily, to insure payment over the long term of the applicable portion of the cost of its supplier's facilities notwithstanding that the future vicissitudes of the business may diminish, or even eliminate, the value of the facilities.

The Court stated that in event the changed conditions occur, the Commission "would of course give immediate consideration to any future complaint of injury . . ." (Appendix B, p. 10a). If such consideration is to be given, how much more appropriate it is to take account of it at the outset, namely, by deleting the long term commitment so that the problem cannot arise. Certainly, regulation should not help perpetuate an industry against the day when it is beset by price and technological competition. Such a prospect, though in the future, becomes a present wrong through the required contractual commitment.

ii. The Gas Service Agreement Precludes a Long Term Billing Rate Commitment Under Mobile and Sierra Pacific.

The Court of Appeals stated (see Appendix B, p. 11a) in effect that, even if the Commission's decision had the effect of unilaterally changing Petitioner's existing Service Agreement with Ohio Fuel without the necessary finding

of adverse affect on the public interest, Petitioner was not aggrieved thereby. Such a construction enables the unilateral rewriting of contractual rights effective in the future simply because the future is not foretold. We know of no rule of contract law permitting this. We understand *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific* to mean that a contract is a contract until the Commission makes the required finding.

In addition, the Court of Appeals asserted that the Service Agreement contemplates future filings and that therefore no unilateral change had been made.* This was not discussed in the Commission's opinion and is, we believe, dispelled by the contractual provisions quoted in the "Statement of Case." In brief, the Service Agreement provides that the rates originally in effect could be superseded but that the General Terms and Conditions were fixed for the term of the contract, unless the Commission should find an adverse affect on the public interest, etc. This is purely a matter of the interpretation of the Agreement; but it has wider importance because of the fact that many similar agreements have been executed by others due to the standardization of the form of Service Agreements instituted under the tariff conversion program of the Commission. See Commission Order No. 144, issued October 30, 1948.

The Court of Appeals also asserted that, even if the Service Agreement did not contemplate unilateral change of the short term rate commitment, the necessary finding as to adverse affect on the public interest had been made by the Commission. However, we believe we have shown under Point 1. above that the Commission did not consider this contention, let alone find that the existing Agreement had an adverse affect on the public interest. It is clear from *Sierra Pacific* that the finding must be directed against the existing contract:

---

* Cf. The *Memphis* case, supra.

"But while it may be that the Commission may not normally impose upon a public utility a rate which would produce less than a fair return, it does not follow that the public utility may not itself *agree by contract to a rate affording less than a fair return or that, if it does so, it is entitled to be relieved of its improvident bargain*" (350 U. S. 348, at p. 355). (Emphasis added.)

Indeed, no valid finding could be made against the short term commitment in view of *Market Street Railway Co., supra.*

iii. The Unlawful Extension of the Long Term Commitment to the Electric Business.

Petitioner carries on a substantial electric, as well as gas, business. Since the long term commitment for minimum demand revenues is to be entered into by it as a corporation, the commitment is a burden on the electric, as well as the gas, business. In the event of a loss of gas markets and consequent inability to pay the claims for the demand charges, the electric operation and its customers would have to subsidize the gas or risk the adversities of receivership and court house sale.

A fundamental rule of rate regulation is that each class of business is to bear only its share of the costs. The leading case in this field is *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (1944), 324 U. S. 581, where Mr. Justice Douglas stated at p. 588:

"The function which an allocation of costs (including return) is designed to perform in a rate case of this character is clear. The amount of gross revenue from each class of business is known. Some of those revenues are derived from sales at rates which the Commission has no power to fix. The other part of the gross revenues comes from the interstate wholesale

> rates which are under the Commission's jurisdiction. The problem is to allocate to each class of the business its fair share of the costs."

Petitioner's electric operations are in no way responsible for the requirements and costs of the gas business.

Accordingly, Petitioner proposed to the Commission that the commitment of the Gas Service Agreement be limited to the gas business, its revenues and assets (R. 1065).

The Commission held that such a provision would be contrary to the public interest, and then inconsistently indicated that should the rate form become unreasonable, "a remedy is open through appropriate procedure under the Natural Gas Act" (R. 1162).

The Court of Appeals held that Petitioner could "easily" remedy the situation by separately incorporating and committing its gas business and further that Petitioner was not in any event aggrieved until its gas business suffered the sickness of *Market Street Railway, supra.*

We submit, however, that it is not in the public interest to complicate financial structures where the defect can easily be remedied by a change in the Tariff. Again, the unduly burdensome corporate commitment furnishes the present basis for Commission action.

iv. A Public Question Is Involved.

It should be apparent from the foregoing that the decisions of the Commission and Court of Appeals adversely affect hundreds of gas distributing companies throughout the United States.

The Contract Demand rate form with attendant long term commitments are employed by many of the natural gas companies subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Since the natural gas is produced in the Southwest, West and Canada, most gas distributing companies pur-

chase under these tariffs. Such companies would be affected by the contention based on the *Market Street Railway* principle (i).

As to contention (ii) above, many distributing companies have executed gas service agreements similar to Petitioner's existing one, due to the Commission's tariff conversion program discussed above. Accordingly, a decision on Petitioner's Gas Service Agreement could well affect many others. For example of widespread use of this type of Service Agreement, see *Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission, et al.*, U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 13,666, decided November 21, 1957.

As to the third contention, namely (iii) above, many gas distributors also serve electricity and hence all such combination companies would have an interest in the limitation of liability to gas operations.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

WALTER E. BECKJORD,
RICHARD H. RHEIN,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

November 29, 1957.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Walter E. Beckjord, one of the attorneys for The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, Petitioner herein, and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, hereby certify that on the 4th day of December, 1957, I served copies of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari on the several respondents thereto, by mailing a copy thereof, with air mail postage prepaid, to each of the following at the respective addresses shown:

HOWARD E. WAHRENBROCK, ESQ.,
Assistant General Counsel,
Federal Power Comm.,
441 G St., N.W.,
Washington 25, D. C.,

SOLICITOR GENERAL,
U. S. Department of Justice,
Washington 25, D. C.,

Attorneys for Respondent, Federal Power Commission.

ROBERT W. HASTINGS, JR., ESQ.,
132 E. Main Street,
Lancaster, Ohio,

JULIAN DE BRUYN KOPS, ESQ.,
ROY D. BOUCHER, ESQ.,
FREDERICK C. WELLINGTON, ESQ.,
914 Gas & Electric Bldg.,
Dayton 1, Ohio,

Attorneys for Respondents, The City of Lancaster, Ohio and The Dayton Power and Light Company.

E. H. LAYLIN, ESQ.,
16 East Broad Street,
Columbus 15, Ohio,
DONALD B. LEACH, ESQ.,
99 North Front Street,
Columbus, Ohio,

JOHN P. RANDOLPH, ESQ.,
1625 Eye Street N.W.,
Washington, D. C.,

Attorneys for Respondent, The Ohio Fuel Gas Company.

/s/ WALTER E. BECKJORD,
Counsel for Petitioner.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE

We, the undersigned hereby acknowledge service upon each of us of a copy of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari, in our respective capacities and on the date entered below.

	Attorney for	*Date*
_____	_____	_____
	Attorney for	
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Appendix "A"

APPENDIX A

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, CASE NO. 13557, decided June 20, 1957, 247 F. (2d) 557.

Before WILBUR K. MILLER, DANAHER and BASTIAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company seeks review and modification of an order of the Federal Power Commission which permitted Ohio Fuel Gas Company, from which it purchases natural gas, to introduce into its demand-commodity rate structure a contract demand long-term billing commitment provision.

In *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.* v. *Federal Power Comm.*, 1957, 100 U. S. App. D. C. —, 246 F. (2d) 688, this petitioner and its subsidiary attacked a similar order issued with respect to their principal supplier, Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company, on the same grounds asserted here. We held they were not aggrieved by the order and, for that reason, dismissed their petition. This case, being in all respects identical with that one, is controlled by it.

Petition dismissed.

JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

Before WILBUR K. MILLER, DANAHER and BASTIAN, Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

(Filed June 20, 1957)

This case came on to be heard on the record from the Federal Power Commission, and was argued by counsel for petitioner and submitted on the brief by respondent.

Appendix "A"

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the petition for review of the order of the Federal Power Commission in this case be, and it is hereby, dismissed for the reason stated in the opinion this day filed herein.

Date: June 20, 1957.

Per Curiam.

APPENDIX B

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, Case No. 13515, decided June 3, 1957, 246 F. (2d) 688.

Before WILBUR K. MILLER, DANAHER and BASTIAN, Circuit Judges.

WILBUR K. MILLER, Circuit Judge.

[1] Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company and its subsidiary, Union Light, Heat and Power Company,[1] are retail distributors of natural gas purchased at wholesale from Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company. They petition for review and modification of an order of the Federal Power Commission which permitted Central Kentucky and its affiliated supplier, United Fuel Gas Company, to change their demand-commodity rate form by providing for a contract demand over a long term. Under the new form, the billing demand is not to exceed, nor be less than 90 per cent of, a quantity of gas to be agreed upon by the seller and buyer as an estimate of the buyer's maximum-day requirement during the term of the contract between them —usually 20 years.[2] In the rate form previously in effect,

[1] They will be referred to collectively as Cincinnati-Union or as the petitioners.

[2] Other provisions of the Commission-approved proposal (a) imposed penalties on the buyer for unauthorized takes in excess of the agreed

the demand charge was based in general on actual maximum-day demand during the twelvemonth ending with the month of billing or on the average daily demand during the peak month of that period.

The order in question was entered in consolidated proceedings which originated when Central Kentucky and United Fuel filed with the Commission new tariffs providing for substantial increases in both demand and commodity charges, and for the long-term contract demand to which we have referred. At the request of Cincinnati-Union and another, the Commission ordered a hearing limited to the contract demand element of the proposed rate form, and reserved for future hearing and consideration all other issues concerning the new tariffs, including of course the proposed increases in the demand and commodity charges.

After a thorough hearing, in which Cincinnati-Union opposed the entire contract demand provision, the examiner filed a comprehensive opinion, and made detailed findings of fact upon the basis of which he approved the proposed contract demand form. The Commission conducted an *en banc* hearing on exceptions to the examiner's initial decision, following which it approved his action and filed an opinion setting forth at some length its reasons for doing so. We summarize those reasons by selecting language from the opinion without indicating occasional omissions of material in the interest of brevity:

---

maximum, and on the seller for failure to deliver the maximum when required; (b) required the seller to increase the contract quantity on the buyer's request if supply and facilities permitted and, if not, to use due diligence to provide them; (c) permitted the buyer to reduce the maximum-day quantity by 10 per cent during the term of the contract in steps of five per cent in one year; and (d) permitted the seller and buyer further to reduce by agreement the maximum-day quantity if other use could be made of the seller's capacity thereby released.

Appendix "B"

"[T]he primary fact influencing our determination is the magnitude of growth of the space-heating load in the area served by the distribution customers of United Fuel and Central Kentucky. The record shows that not only has this space-heating load mushroomed in the past few years but also that the growth is continuing. The record shows that the design capacity of United Fuel and Central Kentucky is fully utilized only once in approximately every eight years. This capacity is installed on the basis of estimated peak demands of their customers which in turn base their peak estimates upon cold weather conditions occurring, on an average, once in eight years. These annual weather variations result in a 'feast or famine' recovery by United Fuel and Central Kentucky of costs collected through demand charges. The CD [contract demand] rate form will tend to stabilize recovery of these costs.

"The second element in the CD rate form, the length of the term of commitment, also plays a part in our decision. A one-year or other short-term contract would defeat the purposes of the CD rate forms, since it would not minimize the effect of the year-to-year fluctuations in the demand. It would neither stabilize earnings nor encourage use of peak shaving by customers. We do not feel that a commitment over the life of the contract is unreasonable, particularly when it is remembered that our scrutiny in the rate-making process is a continual one.

"The demand revenues accruing through the contracted billing demand charge will not assure United Fuel and Central Kentucky of all fixed costs incurred for the benefit of the customer companies. Obviously, the demand charge which finally results from the second stage of these proceedings will not reflect all fixed costs of United Fuel and Central Kentucky. Of course the rate level, as well as the amount of the demand charge, awaits our further determination."

Appendix "B"

In addition to adopting the findings of the examiner with respect to the matters discussed in its opinion,[3] the Commission made the following express finding:

> "Continued billing by United Fuel and Central Kentucky under rate forms previously prescribed does not give sufficient firmness to the demand charges nor provide for long-term commitments by the customers both of which are essential for continued financial stability of United Fuel and Central Kentucky; nor does such billing encourage use of peak shaving by the customers.

[3] We reproduce those findings of the examiner:

"(6) Long-term contracts for essential southwest gas and the facilities required (a) to meet annual requirements and (b) to have capacity available to meet the estimated maximum peak day have created for United Fuel and Central Kentucky rigid costs of tremendous magnitude.

"(7) The CD rate forms filed by United Fuel and Central Kentucky, as amended, seek to recoup through a minimum billing demand a portion of the costs incurred for having capacity available irrespective of the usage of capacity, and reliable evidence shows that such recoupment has become increasingly necessary as the space heating load has grown and demand revenues (without a CD floor under them) fluctuate more and more in unison with temperature variations.

"(8) The growth of the space heating load of the wholesale customers of United Fuel and Central Kentucky has intensified the necessity of recovering minimum demand revenues from their wholesale customers as provided in the proposed CD rate form as hereinafter further amended in paragraph (C).

"(9) The proposed rate forms as amended recognize the present characteristics of the natural gas industry.

"(10) The proposed CD rate forms as amended distribute demand costs between the wholesale customers of United Fuel and Central Kentucky, with appropriate leeway, in accordance with customer-responsibility therefor.

"(11) The proposed CD rate forms as amended are just and reasonable as between United Fuel and Central Kentucky and their customers and as between the customers themselves.

"(12) Based upon the informed judgment of competent witnesses reflected in the record, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed CD rate forms as amended are just and reasonable since they are, among other things, based upon the financial and operating necessities of the gas business of United Fuel and Central Kentucky.

"(13) The filed CD . . . rate forms of United Fuel and Central Kentucky, together with the revisions of such rate forms, being just, reasonable, non-discriminatory and non-preferential, it is appropriate that they be approved as amended."

Therefore, further use of these rate forms would not be in the public interest."

As we have noted, the petitioners objected to the entire contract demand billing formula in the hearing before the examiner. But, as their objection was primarily to the long-term billing commitment feature, they tell us in their brief that before the Commission "they took exception to the long term billing commitment features and the extension of the commitment to the electric operations and in effect waived their objections to the Contract Demand rate form as to the short term." The petitioners say they favor a contract demand form "*so long* as the ratchet is effectively limited to a short term, such as twelve months, rather than twenty years."

Thus the petition for review is also limited in scope. Cincinnati-Union confine their attack to the long-term billing commitment feature of the contract demand. They say they are aggrieved by the Commission's order "insofar as it approved (a) the long term billing commitment feature of the contract demand rate form, and (b) the extension of that feature to the assets and revenues of your Petitioners' respective electric, as distinguished from gas, operations. . . ." They pray therefore that we modify the Commission's order to provide for

"(i) The elimination of the long term billing commitment feature of the contract demand 'rate form' by limiting the ratchet on the billing demand to a 12 month period, rather than extending it over the life of the Service Agreement;

"(ii) The limitation of the extent of the long term billing commitments with Central Kentucky to the natural gas revenues, plant and assets of your Petitioners, and excluding therefrom the other, including

electric revenues, plant and assets of your Petitioners."

Their statutory right to review of the order depends upon whether the petitioners actually are aggrieved by the portion of it they desire us to modify, which is the only portion of which they complain. Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act,[4] under which the petition for review was filed, provides that any party to a proceeding under the Act aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in such proceeding may obtain a review of such order in this court or in any other appropriate court of appeals by seasonably filing a petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part.

It is therefore essential first to examine the allegations and arguments of the petitioners as to how they are aggrieved by the long-term billing commitment phase, to ascertain whether they have the standing to seek review upon which our jurisdiction depends. The petitioners particularize as to aggrievement due to the long-term billing commitment by making three allegations of injury which we shall discuss in separate numbered sections of this opinion.

1. They assert that the order unlawfully requires them to pay Central Kentucky minimum demand revenues over a long term, even though their gas requirements "might substantially decrease due to loss of business to competitive fuels and technologies." Although this is envisaged only as a possibility, the petitioners inconsistently say that "inevitably" the long-term commitment "will hasten the day of insolvency" for them, and is therefore unlawful under *Market Street R. Co.* v. *Railroad Comm. of State of*

---

[4] 15 U. S. C. A. § 717r(b).

California, 1945, 324 U. S. 548, 65 S. Ct. 770, 89 L. Ed. 1171, and *Spiegel* v. *Public Utilities Comm.*, 1955, 96 U. S. App. D. C. 307, 226 F. (2d) 29. In the *Market Street* case, only constitutional issues were raised. The railway company contended the rate reduction order complained of deprived it of its property without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Supreme Court pointed out that the railway company was a "particularly ailing unit of a generally sick industry" [324 U. S. 548, 65 S. Ct. 774] whose property had been reduced in value by economic forces beyond the possibility of regulatory repair, and upheld the Commission in using as a rate base the sum of $7,950,000 at which the physical property had been offered to the City of San Francisco. It was sold to the city for $7,500,000. In such circumstances historical cost, reproduction cost and prudent investment are not to be considered, said the Court.

This holding would not have applied to the ordinary metropolitan street railway company at the turn of the century, when the industry was flourishing and traction stocks had gilt edges, on the mere possibility of a drastically depressing economic change such as occurred with the advent of the automobile. The *Market Street* holding has no application, as the opinion shows, to a dynamic industry which is in the midst of phenomenal growth. In the *Spiegel* case we directed a remand to the Public Utilities Commission because it had not given an adequate statement of its reasons for adopting the original cost rate base. The case is inapposite here.

The petitioners do not allege that the long-term billing commitment will have any immediate unfavorable impact upon them. They do not contend it will force them to contract for a greater demand than they would agree to under

a short term. In fact, they say the contrary. In discussing "a short term contract demand rate form," such as they propose, Cincinnati-Union state:

> "... The peak load varies from year to year, depending on the severity of the weather conditions. Accordingly, the peak load requirements are calculated on the basis of the most severe condition (referred to as the design peak day) that is likely to be encountered. A Contract Demand equal to that amount would be negotiated with Central Kentucky. . . ."

This means, of course, that in the absence of the long-term demand billing provision, Cincinnati-Union would nevertheless plan each year to meet the estimated demands of their customers at the lowest temperature which, on the average, may be expected to occur once in eight or ten years. This "design peak day" in the average year will be greater than the actual peak.

It is thus clear that Cincinnati-Union do not complain of any present injury from the long-term billing commitment provision. They rely upon the possibility that the natural gas business may become a sick industry, such as the street railway business was when the case of the *Market Street Railway* was before the Supreme Court. But the petitioners did not offer to show by expert opinion or otherwise that the natural gas industry faces such a fate in the foreseeable future. In fact, their own expert witness testified that he considers the gas business to be one of the more stable businesses of this country. They did not even allege that such a debacle is a probability, but were content to say it might happen. This is not enough. To adjust a rate form to the possibility that unanticipated disaster may come to a presently prosperous and stable industry is, we think, unjustifiable, particularly in view of the fact that the Fed-

eral Power Commission is empowered continuously to scrutinize the economic situation of companies subject to its regulation, with authority to act in the public interest at any time, and would of course give immediate consideration to any future complaint of injury through changed conditions. Cf. *Federal Power Comm.* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 1944, 320 U. S. 591, 615, 64 S. Ct. 281, 88 L. Ed. 333.

What Cincinnati-Union seek here is present relief from an undemonstrable future danger. Their economic forebodings should be allayed now, they say. We think they are not presently aggrieved by the long-term billing commitment of the contract demand component in the approved rate form, merely because drastic economic changes now unforeseeable might occur during the term.

2. A second specification of aggrievement due to the long-term billing commitment is the allegation that the order unlawfully approves its extension to the revenues and assets of the electric operations of the petitioners; that is to say, Cincinnati-Union complain that the Commission refused to exclude their electric assets and revenues from liability to their gas creditors. If Cincinnati-Union desire to place their electric departments beyond the reach of gas department creditors, they can easily do so by separately incorporating their electric and gas businesses, subject to the approval of local regulatory authorities having jurisdiction; that they have not done so is the result of their own choice.

But, even if the novel notion that they should be exempt from general corporate liability for gas debts incurred through the operation of the long-term billing commitment could be accepted, the Commission's refusal to grant such exemption does not presently aggrieve the petitioners. For

the electric revenues and assets will not be called upon by gas creditors unless and until the gas industry suffers the sickness of the Market Street Railway, a contingency too remote and speculative to be the basis of rejecting the long-term billing commitment, as seen in the preceding section of this opinion. The petitioners therefore are not presently aggrieved in this respect by the long-term billing commitment, nor will they be in the future, unless and until they are "hastened into insolvency" by its operation.

3. Another specification of aggrievement due to the long-term contract demand is the allegation that, in approving it, the order unlawfully changes the gas service agreements between Central Kentucky and Cincinnati-Union "without the necessary finding that said agreements adversely affect the public interest under the Natural Gas Act." Although under the view we take of the case it is unnecessary to do so, we stop to discuss the merits of this contention. The petitioners rely upon *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 1956, 350 U. S. 332, 76 S. Ct. 373, 100 L. Ed. 373, and *Federal Power Comm.* v. *Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 1956, 350 U. S. 348, 76 S. Ct. 368, 100 L. Ed. 388, which hold, respectively, that the Natural Gas Act and the Federal Power Act do not give natural gas companies and power companies the right by their own unilateral action to change rates established by contract.

These cases are readily distinguishable from this one, for here the service agreement expressly contemplates future filings and there has been no unilateral change in rates fixed by contract. But, had there been, the Commission had the power to change the rate form as it did, provided it made the necessary finding. The Supreme Court said in the *Sierra Power* case, 350 U. S. at page 353, 76 S. Ct. at page 371:

Appendix "B"

". . . The Commission has undoubted power under § 206(a) [5] to prescribe a change in contract rates whenever it determines such rates to be unlawful. While this power is limited to prescribing the rate 'to be thereafter observed' and thus can effect no change prior to the date of the order, the Commission's order here, if based on the necessary findings, could have been effective to prescribe the proposed rate as the rate to be in effect prospectively from the date of the order, June 17, 1954. If the proceedings here satisfied in substance the requirements of § 206(a), it would seem immaterial that the investigation was begun as one into the reasonableness of the proposed rate rather than the existing contract rate.

"The condition precedent to the Commission's exercise of its power under § 206(a) is a finding that the existing rate is 'unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential. . . .' "

This condition precedent was met in the instant case. On the basis of the recitals in the Commission's express finding quoted earlier in this opinion, it concluded: "Therefore, further use of these rate forms [those previously prescribed] would not be in the public interest." It is immaterial, as the Supreme Court said, that the Commission began the investigation to inquire into the reasonableness of the contract demand which was to endure for the life of the contract, rather than the reasonableness of the previous rate form.

But even if the challenged portion of the order had prescribed the longer-term billing commitment contrary to the two Supreme Court cases, the jurisdictional question would remain: are the petitioners presently aggrieved thereby?

[5] Section 206(a) of the Federal Power Act, 16 U. S. C. A. § 824e(a), which is substantially identical with § 5(a) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U. S. C. A. § 717d (a).

They do not say the order impinges on any constitutional right. It follows that, for the reasons given in the foregoing discussion, the only aggrievement therefrom is that which might occur if the presently prosperous natural gas industry should fall upon evil times, with the long-term billing commitment still in effect although the Federal Power Commission had been standing by. As we have seen, this remote possibility is not present aggrievement.

[2] We conclude that none of the petitioners' specifications as to how they are aggrieved by the portion of the order under attack is sufficient to give them the right to review under § 19(b) of the Act. This section means, we think, that a petitioner's aggrievement must be present and immediate, or at least must be demonstrably a looming unavoidable threat. It must be "immediately pressing," as the Supreme Court said in *Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank*, 1948, 333 U. S. 426, 432, 68 S. Ct. 641, 645, 92 L. Ed. 784, from which we quote:

> "Thus the Bank seeks a declaration of its rights *if* it should lose its independence, or *if* the Board of Governors should reverse its policy and seek to invoke the condition even though the Bank remains independent and *if* then the Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should not change their policy not to grant deposit insurance to the Bank as a non-member of the Federal Reserve System. The concurrence of these contingent events, necessary for injury to be realized, is too speculative to warrant anticipatory judicial determinations. Courts should avoid passing on questions of public law even short of constitutionality that are not immediately pressing. Many of the same reasons are present which impel them to abstain from adjudicating constitutional claims against a statute before it effectively and presently impinges on such claims."

Appendix "C"

Since the petitioners are not presently aggrieved by the portion of the order which they ask us to modify, their petition for review will be dismissed.[6]

So ordered.

APPENDIX C

EXCERPTS * FROM OPINION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, *IN THE MATTER OF OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY*, DOCKET No. G-2281.

Exceptions to the initial decision of the Presiding Examiner were filed by Ohio Fuel, The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, and the City of Cincinnati (referred to herein collectively as Cincinnati) and The Dayton Power and Light Company (Dayton). The exceptions raise several issues for our determination, the most important of which is the question of rate form. We also determine the question of the proper rates for the future and for the refund period, including the rate of return for that period. Additionally, we resolve questions as to the proper classification of cost between the demand and commodity components as they are associated with (a) gas purchased from Texas Eastern Transmission Corp ation, (b) LPG Plant—Depreciation, Return and Taxes, and (c) Natural Gas Production Plant—Depreciation, Return and Taxes. Finally, in arriving at a cost of service, we resolve herein two adjustments to Ohio Fuel's cost of service which are questioned by Dayton.

After contesting Ohio Fuel's rate filing on its merits over a period of two and one-half years, Dayton, on June 1,

---

[6] Cf. Memphis Light, Gas & Water Division v. Federal Power Comm., 1957, 99 U. S. App. D. C. —, 243 F. (2d) 628.

* Opinion printed in full, R. 1123.

1956, filed a motion to dismiss and reject Ohio Fuel's filing so far as it relates to a change in rate form. Dayton now claims that the Commission has no jurisdiction to entertain the filing, basing its contention on the theory that the filing constitutes a unilateral change in its contract with Ohio Fuel forbidden by the recent decisions in *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U. S. 332, and *F. P. C.* v. *Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U. S. 348. Ohio Fuel, by answer filed on June 11, 1956, opposes the motion principally on the ground that the billing demand provision proposed to be changed in its filing had previously, in itself, altered and superseded the billing demand provision in the original contract now relied upon by Dayton. Ohio Fuel therefore contends that the billing demand provision in the contract is no longer applicable.

In the circumstances of these proceedings we deem it unnecessary for the purposes of our decision herein to decide between the foregoing opposing contentions. It is our opinion that the *Sierra Pacific* and *Mobile* decisions do not require us, at this stage of the proceedings where we have a complete record before us, to undo the work of the last two and one-half years. Significantly, the Supreme Court modified the instructions of the Court of Appeals in the *Sierra Pacific* case which would have required the Commission to begin anew with a proceeding under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act (comparable to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act). The Supreme Court directed that (350 U. S. at 353):

> If the proceedings here satisfied in substance the requirements of § 206(a), it would seem immaterial that the investigation was begun as one into the reasonableness of the proposed rate rather than the existing contract rate.

Appendix "C"

Here, the proceedings satisfy, in substance, the requirements of Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act. As we show below, continued billing by Ohio Fuel under the average demand basis heretofore used is no longer in the public interest. Since our order approves the CD rate form for the future only, no change in rate form is made effective prior to the date of issuance of our order.

We have given careful consideration to each of the issues presented to us by the exceptions of the various parties and by the motion to dismiss. We have decided that, for the reasons hereinafter stated, the decision of the Presiding Examiner in its major aspects should be reversed and the motion should be denied. The extent of our reversal of the Presiding Examiner's decision is clear from our findings and conclusions which follow.

RATE FORM

The Presiding Examiner rejected Ohio Fuel's proposal to make the CD rate form applicable to its jurisdictional customers.[2] He apparently felt bound by our previous decision in Opinion No. 273, where we rejected the use of the CD rate form by Ohio Fuel. He found the CD rate form to be unjust and unreasonable even though by his own statement the record contains "facts and expert opinions extant upon which a different result could be based." Those facts, and the conclusions we draw from them, lead us to reverse the Presiding Examiner and to find that the use of CD

[2] Pursuant to Ohio Fuel's proposal, jurisdictional customers taking less than 5,000 Mcf on peak day are eligible to purchase under the Small General Service (SGS) Rate Schedule containing a straight commodity rate. Twenty of the twenty-five jurisdictional customers are eligible for service under this rate schedule instead of under the CDS-1 Rate Schedule with its contract demand rate form. Our findings with respect to the rate level of the SGS Rate Schedule are set forth in a later portion of this order.

rate form for the future is just and reasonable under the circumstances of this case.

We have had recent occasion *In the Matter of United Fuel Gas Company, et al.,* Docket No. G-2451, *et al.,* order issued May 11, 1956, to pass upon application of the CD rate form to the sales of natural gas by United Fuel and Central Kentucky to their distribution company customers. The significant factors leading to our approval of the CD rate forms as applied to the jurisdictional sales of these affiliates of Ohio Fuel in the Columbia Gas System are also present in this case.

The primary factor, as disclosed in the record, which influences our decision is the effect of the tremendous increase in the space-heating load by ultimate consumers purchasing gas from the distribution company customers of Ohio Fuel. As an example, the record shows that the space-heating saturation on Dayton's system was approximately 77% in 1955, representing 110,800 residential customers. This compares with a 21% saturation in 1946. The peak-day requirements of Dayton, as shown by actual experience and as projected into the future, illustrate a comparable increase. The same condition pertains to the rate of growth of the space-heating load of other wholesale customers of Ohio Fuel.

It is characteristic of this space-heating load to fluctuate widely with changing weather conditions. These fluctuations are not only winter peaks but, more importantly, year-to-year variations in peak loads. When demand revenues accruing to Ohio Fuel are made dependent upon actual purchases by the wholesale customers which, in turn, are dependent upon the weather, it is clear that Ohio Fuel will be subjected to a "feast or famine" recovery of costs collected through demand charges. As the space-heating load

with consequent high-peak requirement increases, the year-to-year fluctuations in recovery of costs collected through demand charges would become more accentuated by the weather conditions. In our judgment, a rate form which does not recognize this situation and bring a measure of stability in recovery of those costs collected through demand charges is no longer just and reasonable.

The CD rate form, as proposed by Ohio Fuel and which we find just and reasonable under the circumstances of this case, will tend to stabilize recovery of demand charges collected from the distribution company customers.[3] Additionally, the CD rate form, with its 90% ratchet provision, will encourage control of the peak demands by distribution company customers either through construction and use of peak-shaving facilities or through use of other means available to them. Since distribution company customers will be obligated to pay for 90% of their contract demands over the period of the contract term, they will be encouraged not only to keep their load factors high, but also to avoid year-to-year fluctuations in requirements from Ohio Fuel.[4] To the extent economical, the customers will stabilize peak demands from Ohio Fuel and Ohio Fuel will not be required to absorb, through varying demand revenues, the entire effect of year-to-year weather fluctuations.[5] At the same time, customer companies are afforded considerable protection in the provision of the tariff permitting them to reduce their contract demands in two successive 5% stages

[3] It should be noted that although only about 26% (by revenue) of Ohio Fuel's sales are made at wholesale, they are, nevertheless, significant. See Appendices A and B.

[4] A CD rate with a short-term commitment, such as a one-year contract, would not provide a long-term stability in demand revenues.

[5] In time the reduction of the year-to-year fluctuations in Ohio Fuel's demand revenues should reflect a salutary effect on future financing by the Columbia Gas System which, in turn, will also redound to the benefit of Ohio Fuel's wholesale customers.

as a matter of right. The tariff further provides that the contract quantity can be reduced by additional amounts provided the capacity so released can be otherwise used.

Further, the uniform application of CD rate form will tend to reduce discrimination among customers. A rate form geared to average demand would work to the advantage of the low-load factor customer. Under the fluctuating weather conditions shown in this record to exist, we can anticipate that without the control afforded by the CD rate form this discrimination would be aggravated in the future. . . .

. . . Consistent with our decision herein, customer companies should be permitted to negotiate new contract quantities under the contract demand rate form.

For the reasons stated above and based upon consideration of the substantial evidence of the entire record, the Commission further *finds:*

EXCERPTS * FROM ORDER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, DENYING APPLICATION FOR REHEARING, *IN THE MATTER OF OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY,* Docket No. G-2281.

(4) Continued billing by Ohio Fuel under the rate form previously prescribed does not give sufficient firmness to the demand revenues nor provide long-term commitments by the customers, both of which are essential for continued financial stability of Ohio Fuel; nor does such billing encourage use of peak shaving by the customers. Therefore, further use of this rate form, prospective from the July 1956 billing month, would not be in the public interest.

(9) Ohio Fuel should file revised tariff sheets reflecting rates and charges, to be effective commencing with

* Order printed in full, R. 1161.

the July 1956 billing month, of $1.56 per Mcf of demand and 32.45¢ per Mcf of commodity, based upon a contract demand rate form including the modifications proposed by Ohio Fuel in Exhibit No. 38 to this proceeding.

In its request for rehearing, Cincinnati reiterates its claim that the long-term commitment contained in the CD rate form approved by our June 29, 1956, order extends to the electric utility business of Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company. Such a commitment, it is argued, forces unregulated business to subsidize regulated business contrary to the principle that the rates for a regulated business should be based upon the cost of service of that business. What Cincinnati wants, however, is something quite different.[2] It asks for a guarantee that its payments for gas under the CD rate need be paid only from revenues received from its gas business. Cincinnati would extend this guarantee even to limit a court judgment so that only the assets of Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company's gas business would stand as security for the payment of gas. Aside from its doubtful validity, such a limitation of liability is contrary to the public interest.

Furthermore, should the rate level or rate form prescribed in our order become unreasonable at some future time because of a change in economic or technological con-

---

[2] Clearly, the fact that Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company may involve some of its electric utility assets in the purchase of gas is irrelevant to the principle that nonjurisdictional business should not be required to subsidize jurisdictional business. The principle requires a proper allocation between Ohio Fuel's jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional business so that the rates charged by Ohio Fuel to its jurisdictional customers will return only the cost of rendering service to them. The record shows the scrupulous care we have taken to assure a proper allocation in this proceeding and Cincinnati does not take issue with any item of our allocation.

ditions, a remedy is open through appropriate procedure under the Natural Gas Act. . . .

We have considered the other contentions raised by the applications for rehearing, including Cincinnati's objection to the long-term billing commitment of the CD rate form, the effect of the *Mobile*[3] and *Sierra Pacific*[4] decisions, the application o fthe CD rate form to rates for the refund period, and the bare allegations of the City of Lancaster. We find that they are not sufficiently material to warrant further discussion here, or that they have been fully considered and correctly disposed of in our order issued June 29, 1956, in this proceeding.[5] Accordingly, in the light of the entire record and upon reconsideration of all the issues presented, we again conclude that our order issued June 29, 1956, correctly disposed of all material issues of fact, law and discretion presented, and that the relevant evidence provides substantial support for our determination.

The Commission *finds:*

(1) The applications for rehearing of our order issued in this proceeding on June 29, 1956, set forth no facts and no principles of law which either were not fully

---

[3] *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U. S. 332.

[4] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U. S. 348.

[5] In its application for rehearing, Cincinnati suggests that the Commission is required by Section 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act to make a ruling or finding upon each of its proposals as an intervening party. That the Commission is not bound to specify, in detail, its reasoning and rulings upon each proposal of every party to the administrative proceedings is clear so long as the basic findings and sufficient subsidiary findings are made which unmistakably inform the parties of the Commission's rulings and the manner in which they were arrived at. *National Coal Association* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 191 F. 2d 462; *N. L. R. B.* v. *State Center Warehouse & Cold Storage Co.*, 193 F. 2d 156. There can be no doubt as to our ruling on each material issue in this proceeding and the reasons which have led us to those conclusions.

considered by the Commission when it adopted said order or which, having now been considered, warrant any change in or modification of such order.

(2) For the reasons set forth above, the motion for clarification filed by Dayton on July 12, 1956, should be dismissed and the motion for stay filed by Cincinnati with its application for rehearing on July 30, 1956, should be denied.

The Commission *orders:*

(A) The motion for clarification filed by Dayton on July 12, 1956. is hereby dismissed and the motion for stay filed by Cincinnati on July 30, 1956, is hereby denied.

(B) The applications for rehearing of our order issued June 29, 1956, in this docket, filed by the City of Lancaster, Ohio, and Cincinnati, are hereby denied.

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 30 1957
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. 642

THE CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, THE OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY, THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, AND THE CITY OF LANCASTER, OHIO,
Respondents.

BRIEF OF THE OHIO FUEL GAS COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

E. H. LAYLIN
16 East Broad Street
Columbus 15, Ohio

JOHN PEYTON RANDOLPH
1625 "I" Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Attorneys for The Ohio Fuel Gas Company

DONALD B. LEACH
99 North Front Street
Columbus 15, Ohio
Of Counsel

SUBJECT INDEX

PAGE

THE OPINIONS BELOW 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

1. Under the circumstances of this case, a decision that Petitioner is not aggrieved properly precludes consideration of formal procedural objections to the Commission's orders 4

2. The Court of Appeals correctly decided that Petitioner was not aggrieved by the Commission's Order and that its three substantive claims were not, in any event, well taken 6

(i) The Market Street Railway case 7

(ii) "Mobile" and "Sierra Pacific" 7

(iii) Petitioner's Electric Business 10

(iv) No Public Question Is Involved 10

CONCLUSION 11

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 12

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Judicial Decisions

Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. v. *Federal Power Commission*, 100 U. S. App. D. C. , 246 F. 2d 688 (filed June 3, 1957) 2

THE OPINIONS BELOW

The Petition seeks review of a Judgment of the Court of Appeals filed June 20, 1957, based on an opinion filed on that day (Petition p. 1a). In dismissing Petitioner's appeal, the opinion states that this proceeding, being in all respects identical with *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 100 U. S. App. D. C. , 246 F. 2d 688, is controlled by the prior opinion, filed June 3, 1957. In such prior proceeding, Petitioner unsuccessfully appealed from a decision of the Commission involving the rate form under which Petitioner purchased gas from Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company. (Petition, pp. 2a to 14a). No petition for writ of certiorari has been filed with this Honorable Court to review the decision of June 3, 1957 in said Central Kentucky case.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

With most of the Petitioner's narrative under this heading we have no quarrel. However, it should be pointed out that the Commission proceedings, which began with a suspension order issued October 16, 1953 (R. 989) and eventuated in a final order issued June 29, 1956 (R. 1123) were concerned with the form of rate to be used by Ohio Fuel for its sales of natural gas subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Most of the evidence related to Ohio Fuel's contention that the pre-existing "average day" rate form*

*The difference between the pre-existing rate form and the contract demand rate form approved by the Commission relates to the method of computing the billing demand to which the demand charge in the two-part demand-commodity rate is applied. The billing demand under the pre-existing rate form was the highest average daily delivery during any month of the prior twelve months. Billing demands varied depending upon the actual usage which in turn reflected the fluctuations in winter temperatures. Under the contract demand rate form, the billing demand is the highest single day's delivery

was in fact unjust and unreasonable. The Order of June 29, 1956, after specifically finding that to be the fact, (Petition, p. 19a), ordered, pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act, that the "contract demand" rate should be made effective for the future, i.e., after the date of that Order (Petition, pp. 19a-20a).

Petitioner's present contentions are made without substantial evidentiary support. In the Hearing before an Examiner of the Commission, Petitioner's evidence was calculated to support an average day rate form (R. 378). After the case was submitted to the Examiner, Petitioner changed its position and advocated a "short term contract demand" rate form. It was not until after this change of position that it also advanced its arguments based on *Market Street Railway Company* v. *Railroad Commission of California*, 324 U. S. 548; and *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U. S. 332, and *Sierra Pacific Power Co.* v. *F. P. C.* 350 U. S. 348, the primary points asserted by Petitioner before the Court of Appeals and in its petition herein.

The first citation to the record at which Petitioner claims to have made its present contentions (Petition, p. 7), is its Application for Rehearing to the Commission; those contentions were thoroughly considered and rejected (Petition, p. 20a, et seq.).

In its Order of June 29, 1956, the Commission referred to its Order of May 11, 1956, at its Docket No. G-2451 (e.g. Petition, p. 17a). The Court's Opinion issued June 3, 1957 (Petition, pp. 2a-14a), dismissed this Petitioner's attempt to review the Commission's Order of May 11, 1956.

---

during the twelve months period ending with the current billing month but in no event less than 90% of the contract quantity which seller is obligated to deliver and in no event more than such contract quantity. The contract quantity is determined by negotiation between the parties and continues for the contract term, subject to certain rights of the buyer to reduce the contract quantity during the term of the contract.

Thus, both the Court of Appeals and the Commission relied upon their previous orders in the earlier case; Petitioner's contentions concerning the specific responses of the Commission to its various arguments must, therefore, be examined by reference not only to the order, in this case, but to those issued in the other case as well. The Court's Opinion of June 3, 1957 contains a sufficient reference to and quotation from the earlier Commission order to demonstrate the complete lack of merit in Petitioner's complaints, even assuming it has standing as an "aggrieved party" to assert them.

We have restated Petitioner's first reason to reflect the issue as it is presented by the facts in this case.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

1. Under the circumstances of this case, a decision that Petitioner is not aggrieved properly precludes consideration of formal procedural objections to the Commission's orders.

The first reason advanced in support of the Petition herein is the contention that the Court of Appeals avoided consideration of Petitioner's procedural objections. Such procedural objections are to the effect that the Commission failed to comply with Section 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act in that it did not separately answer Petitioner's argument based on *Market Street Railway*, *supra*, and that it did not adequately answer Petitioner's argument based on *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific*, both *supra*.

Petitioner's sole interest herein is its objection to the long term commitment feature of Ohio Fuel's contract demand rate form (Petition, p. 7, p. 6a). All of its other objections, including those based on *Market Street Railway*, *supra*, and on *Mobile* and *Sierra Pacific*, both *supra*, are subsidiary to, and pertinent only insofar as they support, that basic position. That the Commission has fully con-

sidered Petitioner's basic objection to the long term commitment feature of the contract demand rate form is abundantly clear from the quotations contained in the Court of Appeals' Opinion of June 3, 1957 (especially p. 4a et seq. of the Petition), and the Commission's Order on Rehearing (Petition, p. 20a). Petitioner cannot fail to know what disposition was made of its claims and the reasons given. (See footnote 5, Petition, p. 21a).

Apparently Petitioner would have it that a party who has no standing to seek review of an administrative order is, nevertheless, entitled to that review. (e.g., Petition, p. 13). Though the Petition lacks any contention, under its first reason, that Petitioner is in *fact* "aggrieved" (save for a bald assertion at page 14 that the result is a "grevious wrong to Petitioner"), it nevertheless seems to insist that it deserves a full consideration of all its contentions on the "merits". (As pointed out under point 2, below, Petitioner's contentions received full consideration on the merits by the Court).

This Court has thoroughly disposed of this sort of claim in *Federal Power Commission* v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.*, 348 U. S. 492. There the petitioner lacked standing to seek review of part of a Commission order because it had not applied to the Commission for a rehearing on that part. It was asserted, as it is here (Petition, pp. 12-13) that the Administrative Procedure Act requires review despite failure to qualify under the Natural Gas Act, but the Court held at page 500 of 348 U.S.: "It is not a reasonable interpretation of the general terms of that Act to hold that they repeal the administrative procedures specifically set forth in the Natural Gas Act." To the same effect is *Magnolia Petroleum Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, (C. A. 5) 236 F. 2d 785, 793.

Furthermore, the Administrative Procedure Act provides in Section 10(e) (quoted in the Petition at page 5) that "due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial

error." A party that is not "aggrieved" has not been subjected to "prejudicial error". cf. *Kansas City Power & Light Company, et al.* v. *McKay*, C. A. D. C. 96 U. S. App. D. C. 273, 225 F. 2d 924.

Thus, if Petitioner is not aggrieved, as the Court found, the Court of Appeals is not required to consider Petitioner's procedural claims, and the first "Question" presented (Petition, page 2) does not constitute a reason why the petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

2. The Court of Appeals correctly decided that Petitioner was not aggrieved by the Commission's Order and that its three substantive claims were not, in any event, well taken.

Petitioner seems to say that it is presently aggrieved because it must now enter into a long term commitment, the consequences of which may, but need not, be deleterious to Petitioner. Petitioner's position rests solely on argument. The record contains no expert testimony or other evidence to support it (as the Court found, Petition, p. 9a).

In this case after a thorough investigation (there were 37 days of hearing and well over 100 exhibits and "items" of documentary evidence), the Commission determined to base its decision concerning rate form on present facts, and to reserve for possible future consideration, in the exercise of its admitted continuing jurisdiction, contentions which were based at best upon speculation as to what might possibly happen in the future. The Petitioner has not raised any issue before the Commission or the Court below that the decision with respect to present facts was erroneous. Its sole claim of aggrievement was based on possible events which might occur in the future. The Court found that such possibilities did not give the Petitioner the status of an aggrieved party.

Nevertheless, we shall examine Petitioner's separate contentions.

(i) The Market Street Railway case.

Both the Court (Petition, pages 7a-11a) and the Commission (Petition, pages 4a-5a and 20a) thoroughly considered the applicability of this case. The natural gas industry, as the entire record amply shows (e.g. Petition, p. 17a) is a dynamic and rapidly growing one. Whether it will ever become a "generally sick industry" (324 U. S. 548—Petition, p. 8a) cannot now be told. Petitioner's evidence was that it is a healthy and expanding business (Petition, p. 9a, R. 295-297, 304). Values connected with it have certainly not "been lost by operation of economic forces" (Petition, p. 15). These are questions of *fact*.

Petitioner's complaint is against the Commission's order as it relates to *rate form;* such decision does not preclude the Commission, now or in the future, from applying the concept of the Market Street case in determining the level of Ohio Fuel's rates.

There was no basis on the record, nor is there any in law, to require reversal of the Commission's determination that Petitioner's presently unfounded apprehensions should not control the result. Thus, the Court's holding that presently groundless fears do not constitute aggrievement is eminently proper. *Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank,* 333 U. S. 426, 432.

(ii) "Mobile" and "Sierra Pacific"

At the outset it must be noted that Petitioner is here urging an inconsistent position. It says that the Commission did not make adequate findings under the *Sierra Pacific* case to set aside its contract. The contract it alleges constitutes the general terms and conditions attached to

the former rate schedule which contained the average day rate form. Petitioner does not support that rate form. It agrees with the Commission that such form is unjust and unreasonable (Petition, p. 11). It wants a different rate form, to wit, a "short term contract demand" (See Petition, p. 6a), to which the old general terms and conditions would simply not be applicable. (See R. 952-968, especially R. 963-965.) Thus, Petitioner is not relying on the contract, but at the same time it condemns the Commission for allegedly failing to make the proper findings to set it aside. This is a clear demonstration that the Petitioner is not aggrieved.

Even assuming that this contention can be consistently asserted, the record is against Petitioner. (See the Commission's opinion of June 29, 1956 (Petition, pp. 14a-16a, 18a, 19a), its Order on Rehearing (Petition, p. 21a) and the Court's Opinion (Petition, pp. 11a-13a)). The Commission's "findings" (which are findings of *fact*) came after two and one-half years of consideration. There were 37 days of hearings, most of which, as previously stated, were devoted to taking evidence relating to the reasonableness of the previously prescribed rate forms. As the Examiner stated (R. 1026), "The present Ohio Fuel attack is beamed primarily at the rate form aspects of Opinion 273." (which had prescribed the "average-day" rate—see the Commission's Opinion in this case at Petition, p. 16a). The finding of paramount public interest is certainly sustained by the evidence, as both Commission and Court found. The Petition does not challenge the sufficiency of that evidence.

Petitioner's complaint against the possible future effect of "unilateral rewriting of contractual rights effective in the future" because of present factual necessity, is purely a formal one; it "comes down, on the record, to nothing more than the bare possibility of some injury in the future". *Gange Lumber Co.* v. *Rowley*, 326 U. S. 295, 305. He who

asserts it is not "aggrieved" in the absence of a showing of "substantial and more immediate harm." (id.)

Petitioner seems to complain (Petition, p. 11) that the findings in the Order of June 29, 1956 came in response to contentions urged by another party, but there is no assertion that they are not equally applicable to Petitioner's claims (see Note 4; Petition, p. 18a). No such assertion could be made because both contracts, that of Petitioner and that of the other party, were in the record. At any rate, specific attention was given to these matters in the Order overruling the Application for Rehearing (Petition, p. 21a).

Petitioner also asserts (Petition, p. 17) that the Court went further than the Commission had gone and determined that Petitioner's contract with Ohio Fuel "contemplated" future changes. On this point Petitioner directs this Court's attention to a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division* v. *Federal Power Commission*, issued November 21, 1957, with which decision, however, Petitioner does not agree (Petition p. 8) since it asserts that the rate level (Petition p. 17) and certain aspects of the rate form (Petition pp. 8, 11, 6a) may be changed.

It may be that on the limited point as to the "contemplation of future filings" the decision in this case does not square with that in the *Memphis* case, decided by the same Court on a far different record, Judge Bastian joining in both opinions. That point is, however, not decisive of this case, not only because, as finally found, Petitioner is not aggrieved, but because here the Commission conducted a full and exhaustive inquiry into the reasonableness of the previous rate and found, as authorized by the *Sierra Pacific* decision, that its continued use "is no longer in the public interest" (Petition, p. 16a).

(iii) Petitioner's Electric Business.

Again, the point is purely speculative. In making it, Petitioner can say only "in the event of a loss of gas markets * * *" certain consequences might occur. (Petition, p. 18). But there is no contention that such a loss is inevitable or even likely, or that such consequences would follow from such loss. *Federal Trade Commission* v. *National Lead Co.*, 352 U. S. 419, 431.

Both the Commission (Petition, p. 20a) and the Court (Petition, p. 10a-11a) dealt thoroughly with the contention and found against it on the *facts*. The only authority which Petitioner cites has to do with the allocation of costs. When the rates at which Petitioner sells its products are fixed, a proper allocation of its costs would be necessary to be sure that its electric customers do not pay the costs of its gas operations and vice versa. That is not a matter of concern in this case.

(iv) No Public Question is Involved.

Since, as the Court of Appeals has correctly determined, the adverse effect of the decision complained of upon Petitioner is not sufficient to entitle it to appeal as a person "aggrieved", it is difficult to see how that decision could have any effect upon others not parties to this proceeding.

Disappointed litigants have frequently failed in efforts to review administrative determinations because the record has shown they were not aggrieved. *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, (C. A. 5), 203 F. 2d 78; *Woodmen of the World Life Insurance Society* v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 70 U. S. App. D. C. 196, 105 F. 2d 75; *Home Gas Company* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 97 U. S. App. D. C. 300, 231 F. 2d 253, 256-7; and *Dayton Power & Light Company* v. *Federal Power Commission*, (C. A. D. C.) 246 F. 2d 694.

Petitioner's lack of standing in this case cannot deprive any of the "hundreds of gas distributing companies throughout the United States" of whatever relief the facts in proceedings to which they are parties may justify.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set out herein, it is respectfully urged that the Petition does not exhibit special and important reasons why, in the exercise of a sound judicial discretion, the writ of certiorari should be granted. All questions of Federal law sought to be raised have been decided in previous cases, and the decision of the Court of Appeals is in no way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court. The first Question has been answered many times; the second, at most, would require this Court to "review evidence and discuss specific facts", *United States* v. *Johnston*, 268 U. S. 220, 227.

Dated: December 26, 1957

Respectfully submitted,

E. H. LAYLIN
16 East Broad Street
Columbus 15, Ohio

JOHN PEYTON RANDOLPH
1625 "I" Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Attorneys for The Ohio Fuel Gas Company

DONALD B. LEACH
99 North Front Street
Columbus 15, Ohio
Of Counsel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, John P. Randolph, one of the attorneys for The Ohio Fuel Gas Company, Respondent herein, and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, hereby certify that on the 30th day of December, 1957, I served copies of the foregoing Brief in Opposition to the Petition for Writ of Certiorari on Petitioner and the other respondents, by mailing a copy thereof, with air mail postage prepaid, to each of the following at the respective addresses shown.

HOWARD E. WAHRENBROCK, ESQ.
Solicitor,
Federal Power Comm.,
441 G St., N. W.,
Washington 25, D. C.

SOLICITOR GENERAL,
U. S. Department of Justice,
Washington 25, D. C.

Attorneys for Respondent, Federal Power Commission.

ROBERT W. HASTINGS, JR., ESQ.
132 E. Main Street,
Lancaster, Ohio
Attorney for Respondent, The City of Lancaster, Ohio

JULIAN DE BRUYN KOPS, ESQ.
ROY D. BOUCHER, ESQ.
FREDERICK C. WELLINGTON, ESQ.
914 Gas & Electric Bldg.,
Dayton 1, Ohio
Attorneys for Respondent, The Dayton Power and Light Co.

WALTER E. BECKJORD,
PECK, SHAFFER & WILLIAMS,
1602 First National Bank Bldg.,
Cincinnati, Ohio,

RICHARD H. RHEIN,
4th & Main Streets,
Cincinnati, Ohio,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

/s/ JOHN P. RANDOLPH
Attorney for The Ohio Fuel Gas Company

INDEX

	Page
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Questions presented	2
Statute involved	2
Statement	3
The contract-demand rate form	3
The Commission's order	6
The decision below	9
Argument	10
Conclusion	18

CITATIONS

Cases:

American Power & Light Co. v. *Securities & Exchange Commission*, 325 U. S. 385	11
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., et al. v. *Federal Power Commission*, 246 F. 2d 688	1, 3, 9
Eccles v. *Peoples Bank*, 333 U. S. 426	10, 14
Federal Communications Commission v. *Sanders Brothers Radio Station*, 309 U. S. 470	11
Federal Power Commission v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.*, 348 U. S. 492	17
Federal Power Commission v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U. S. 591	15
Great Western Broadcasting Ass'n v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 94 F. 2d 244	12
Market Street R. Co. v. *Railroad Commission of California*, 324 U. S. 548	13, 14
Mitchell v. *Covington Mills*, 229 F. 2d 506, certiorari denied, 350 U. S. 1002	11
National Broadcasting Co. v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 132 F. 2d 545, affirmed, 319 U. S. 239	11, 12
National Coal Ass'n v. *Federal Power Commission*, 191 F. 2d 462	11, 12
Ohio Fuel Gas Co., The, 15 F. P. C. 1623, 14 P. U. R. (3d) 266	1

Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company v. *Federal Power Commission*, 219 F. 2d 729, certiorari denied, 349 U. S. 945 ..... Page 11, 12
United States v. *Storer Broadcasting Co.*, 351 U. S. 192 11
United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Ass'n v. *McNutt*, 138 F. 2d 116 ..... 11, 12
Yankee Network, Inc. v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 107 F. 2d 212 12

Statutes:

Administrative Procedure Act, Sec. 10, 5 U. S. C. 1009 ..... 9, 16, 17, 18
Natural Gas Act, 52 Stat. 821, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 717, *et seq.*:
Sec. 4 9
Sec. 5 9
Sec. 19 (b) 2, 3, 10, 16

Miscellaneous:

Federal Power Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C. F. R., Section 1.1 (f) (13) 12

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. 642

THE CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, PETITIONER

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The findings and order of the Federal Power Commission (R. 1123) are reported as *The Ohio Fuel Gas Company,* 15 F. P. C. 1623, 14 P. U. R. (3d) 266. The Commission's Findings and its Order Denying Applications for Rehearing, etc., are set out in the record at R. 1161, *et seq.* The opinion of the Court of Appeals (Pet. App. 1a) is reported at 247 F. 2d 556 and states that the petition for review was dismissed for the reasons set forth in *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 246 F. 2d 688 (Pet. App. 2a–14a).

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on June 20, 1957 (R. 1226). A petition for rehearing, timely filed, was denied on September 9, 1957 (R. 1231). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on December 5, 1957. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. 1254 (1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner, a distributor of natural gas, was "aggrieved" by an order of the Federal Power Commission authorizing the substitution by one of its suppliers of a long-term contract-demand rate form for petitioner's existing commitment under a one-year average daily-demand rate form.

2. Whether, even if petitioner was "aggrieved" by this order and may therefore challenge it, the order should be upheld as valid.

STATUTE INVOLVED

Section 19 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U. S. C. 717r (b), provides in pertinent part:

> Any party to a proceeding under this Act aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in such proceeding may obtain a review of such order * * * in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by filing in such court, within sixty days after the order of the Commission upon the application for rehearing, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. * * *

STATEMENT

Petitioner, a retail distributor of natural gas, sought review in the Court of Appeals under Section 19 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, *supra*, p. 2, of an order of the Federal Power Commission (R. 1123–1144) issued in a proceeding on a proposed increase of rates and charges by the Ohio Fuel Gas Company, one of petitioner's suppliers of natural gas at wholesale. Petitioner complained chiefly of the fact that the Commission's order authorized the substitution of a long-term contract-demand rate form for the one-year "average daily demand" method previously used by Ohio Fuel in determining petitioner's demand charge. The Court of Appeals dismissed the petition on the ground that petitioner was not aggrieved by the order, citing its earlier decision in No. 13515, *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 246 F. 2d 688. The facts and pertinent issues may be summarized as follows:

The Contract-Demand Rate Form.—The price which petitioner pays for its natural gas is determined on the basis of a two-part rate formula consisting of a demand charge and a commodity charge. The commodity charge is applied to the actual quantity of gas delivered, while the demand charge is designed to compensate the seller for the costs of keeping in readiness facilities and supplies necessary to meet the customer's maximum daily volume of gas. Prior to August 10, 1951, Ohio Fuel used the "average daily demand" method for determining the demand component of petitioner's rate. The "average daily demand" is the highest average daily delivery dur-

ing any month in the 12-month period ending with the current billing month, and is computed by dividing the total volume of gas purchased in a peak month by the number of days in the month. The "contract demand" (CD) form, on the other hand, computes the demand component of the rate on the basis of an agreed-upon estimate of the maximum daily demand of each customer, rather than the average daily demand actually experienced. In either case, of course, the supplier must design its facilities on the basis of estimates furnished to it by its wholesale customers, such as petitioner. The basic difference between the two forms of computing the demand component of the rate is that, under the average demand method, the seller will not recover its costs in warmer than estimated years (when less gas is used), while in colder than estimated years it will recover more than its costs; under the contract-demand form, recovery of costs is more stable and certain.

As a result of the enormous growth in space heating requirements by consumers,[1] peak day sales of gas now depend almost entirely upon the severity of temperature experienced (R. 380–382), and accordingly fluctuate widely, not only from summer lows to winter peaks, but, more importantly, from year to year (R. 1128). In order to minimize the effect of these yearly fluctuations, Ohio Fuel, on September 18, 1953 (R. 573), filed with the Commission a tariff

[1] In 1945, petitioner's residential space-heating customers numbered 14,591 out of a total of 229,383 customers, or a 6.4% saturation (R. 329–330); in 1954, petitioner had 277,617 customers, of which 121,599 were for space heating, or a saturation of 43.8% (*ibid.*).

containing a contract-demand rate form providing for a monthly demand charge of $1.75 per Mcf of billing demand and a 32.5¢ commodity charge for all gas delivered (R. 577–578). The tariff provides that the billing demand for the month shall be the higher of (*a*) the greatest day's aggregate delivery of gas to the buyer during the twelve months ending with the close of the current billing month or (*b*) 90% of the contract demand, but that in no event shall the billing demand exceed the contract demand (R. 578–579). The tariff defines the agreed-upon estimate—the "contract demand"—as the maximum quantity of gas which a buyer is entitled to receive and Ohio Fuel is obligated to deliver on a single day, pursuant to an executed service agreement (usually with a 20-year term) (R. 581).

The principal change effected by the CD rate is that in effect it puts a floor under the billing demand, so that over the life of the service agreement it cannot become less than 90% of the current contract demand. The initiative for the establishment of the contract quantity rests with the buyer, who notifies Ohio Fuel as to the maximum quantity of gas it desires Ohio Fuel to have available for it on a single day (R. 596). The tariff specifies penalties to be imposed upon the buyer for unauthorized takes in excess of the contract quantity, and upon Ohio Fuel for failure to deliver amounts requested by the buyer up to the contract quantity (R. 530). If gas supply and facilities are available, however, the buyer may request an increase in the contract quantity, and the seller, if it is not in a position to meet the request,

must use "due diligence" to supply the necessary facilities and gas supply (R. 597). Conversely, the buyer as a matter of right can reduce the then effective contract quantity 10% over the life of the contract in steps of 5% in one year, and, in addition, buyer and seller may mutually agree to reduce the contract below 90% of the previous contract demand, provided the capacity so released can be otherwise used (R. 537–538).

The Commission's Order.—On June 29, 1956, after extensive proceedings,[2] the Commission issued its findings and order approving the contract-demand rate form substantially as proposed. With respect to that form the Commission made the ultimate findings that—

(1) The contract-demand rate form as proposed by Ohio Fuel is just and reasonable (R. 1129), and

(2) The uniform application of the contract-demand rate form will tend to reduce discrimination among customers (R. 1130).

(3) Further use of the average daily demand rate form would not be in the public interest (R. 1137–1138).

These findings were predicated on subsidiary findings which may be summarized as follows:

(1) The evidence in the record shows the effect of the tremendous increase in the space-heating load by ultimate consumers purchasing gas from the distribution company customers of Ohio Fuel. As an example,

[2] The hearing before the examiner, in which petitioner participated as an intervenor, consumed thirty-seven hearing days; the record comprises approximately 4,600 pages of testimony, 72 exhibits, and 60 items by reference.

the space-heating saturation in the Dayton Power and Light Company's system was approximately 77% in 1955, representing 110,800 residential customers, compared with a 21% saturation in 1946. As a consequence, the peak-day requirements of Dayton and other wholesale customers, as shown by actual expe-ence and as projected into the future, show a comparable increase (R. 1128).

(2) It is characteristic of this space-heating load to fluctuate widely with changing weather conditions. These fluctuations include not only winter peaks and summer valleys, but more importantly, year-to-year variations in peak loads. When demand revenues accruing to Ohio Fuel are made dependent upon actual purchases by the wholesale customers which, in turn, are dependent upon the weather, it is clear that Ohio Fuel will be subjected to a "feast or famine" recovery of costs collected through demand charges. As the space-heating load with consequent high-peak requirement increases, the year-to-year fluctuations in recovery of costs collected through demand charges would become more accentuated by the weather conditions. "In our judgment, a rate form which does not recognize this situation and bring a measure of stability in recovery of those costs collected through demand charges is no longer just and reasonable" (R. 1129).

(3) "The CD rate form, as proposed by Ohio Fuel and which we find just and reasonable under the circumstances of this case, will tend to stabilize recovery of demand charges collected from the distribution company customers" (R. 1129).

(4) The contract-demand rate form will encourage control of peak demands by wholesale customers either

through construction and use of peak-shaving facilities or through use of other means available to them (R. 1129).

(5) The uniform application of the contract-demand rate form will tend to reduce discrimination among wholesale customers (R. 1130).[3]

---

[3] In addition to the foregoing findings, the Commission made the following determinations as to the rate level itself, and other matters (R. 1132–1140):

(1) The Commission prescribed rates for two parts of the refund period, *i. e.*, March 1, 1954 through December 1954, and January 1955 through the June 1956 billing month. These rates were arrived at on an average demand basis (R. 1133–1137).

(2) The Commission ordered that, effective with the July 1956 billing month, Ohio Fuel should file revised tariff sheets reflecting rates and charges of $1.56 per Mcf of demand and 32.45¢ per Mcf of commodity based upon a contract demand rate form including the modifications proposed by Ohio Fuel in Exhibit No. 38 (R. 1139). This provision of the order was predicated on the ground that "[c]ontinued billing by Ohio Fuel under the rate form previously prescribed does not give sufficient firmness to the demand revenues nor provide long-term commitments by the customers, both of which are essential for continued financial stability of Ohio Fuel; nor does such billing encourage use of peak shaving by the customers. Therefore, further use of this rate form, prospective from the July 1956 billing month, would not be in the public interest" (R. 1137–1138).

(3) The Commission approved a 6¼% rate of return for the refund periods (R. 1133).

(4) The Commission also held that (R. 1140):

> The record in this proceeding should be reopened for the purpose of taking additional evidence concerning the effect upon rate of return of Ohio Fuel of our approval of the application of the CD rate form to the sales to Ohio Fuel's resale customers. For the purpose of taking this additional evidence this proceeding should be consolidated with the hearing *In the Matter of United Fuel Gas Co., et al.*, Docket No. G-2451, *et al.*, commencing on July 5, 1956.

(5) The Commission sustained the Presiding Examiner's inclusion in the cost of service of $126,979, because of the in-

The Decision Below.—Upon denial of its motion for rehearing before the Commission, petitioner filed a petition for review in the court below. Petitioner alleged, *inter alia,* that the new rate method was in violation of Sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act, that the Commission's order unlawfully altered the existing contract between petitioner and Ohio Fuel, and that petitioner's electric operations were improperly included within the scope of the long-term commitments imposed by the new rate form. Petitioner contended also that the alleged failure of the Federal Power Commission to answer these contentions violated the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Petitioner did not challenge any part of the Commission's action except the establishment of a long-term period for the contract-demand rate form (see Pet. App. 6a–7a).

The Court of Appeals, citing its earlier opinion in the companion case, No. 13515, *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 246 F. 2d 688 (Pet. 2a–14a), dismissed the petition on the ground that petitioner was not presently aggrieved by the order of the Commission (Pet. 1a).[4]

---

crease in the 1955 Ohio property tax over the 1954 tax. The order said that, since the adjustment reflects a known cost, its inclusion is reasonable (R. 1132).

[4] In No. 13515, Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company similarly contested an order of the Federal Power Commission approving the institution of a contract-demand rate form for another of its suppliers of natural gas, United Fuel Gas Company. Petitioner raised precisely the same issues in its petition for review in that case as it does in the present suit. The Court of Appeals dismissed the petition, writing an extensive opinion (Pet. App. 2a–14a) in which it considered and rejected each of petitioner's

Petitioner is not aggrieved by the Federal Power Commission's order to which it objects. It alleges no present injury from the order, but is concerned solely with possible future difficulties which may arise as a result of its long-term commitments under the new rate form in the unlikely event that economic disaster were to strike the natural gas industry and the Commission were to refuse relief. Such an improbable contingency is "too speculative to warrant anticipatory judicial determinations" (*Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank*, 333 U. S. 426, 432), particularly since the Commission can at any future time revise the rate form in light of changed economic conditions. Petitioner's lack of aggrievement likewise precludes it from contesting the procedural aspects of the Commission's action. In any case, the Commission's order was proper in the circumstances, and should clearly be upheld on its merits.[5]

1. Section 19 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, *supra*, p. 2, limits the initiation of review proceedings to any party to the Commission's proceedings

---

objections to the long-term commitment feature of the contract-demand rate form. In its brief *per curiam* opinion in the present case, the court referred to its opinion in No. 13515, and simply held that this case, "being in all respects identical with that one, is controlled by it" (Pet. App. 1a). Accordingly, our references in the course of this brief to the opinion below are to the opinion in No. 13515, unless otherwise noted.

[5] Despite petitioner's references to *Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission, et al.*, C. A. D. C., No. 13,666 (in which petitions for certiorari are now pending, Nos. 691, 694, and 695, this Term), this case does *not* present the issues of the *Memphis* case.

"aggrieved" by its order. The decisions of this Court and the lower courts, construing the similar language in other statutes relating to judicial review of administrative action, have established that a person is "aggrieved" only if he sustains substantial direct injury as a result of the order complained of. *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Sanders Brothers Radio Station*, 309 U. S. 470, 476–77; *American Power & Light Co.* v. *Securities & Exchange Commission*, 325 U. S. 385, 390; cf. *United States* v. *Storer Broadcasting Co.*, 351 U. S. 192; see also *Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 219 F. 2d 729 (C. A. 3), certiorari denied, 349 U. S. 945; *Mitchell* v. *Covington Mills*, 229 F. 2d 506, 511 (C. A. D. C.) (concurring opinion), certiorari denied, 350 U. S. 1002; *National Coal Ass'n* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 191 F. 2d 462, 464–465 (C. A. 2). This injury "must be something more than nominal or highly speculative" (*National Broadcasting Co.* v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 132 F. 2d 545, 548 (C. A. D. C.), affirmed, 319 U. S. 239); it must be "probable injury of a substantial character" (*ibid.*) which is "traceable with reasonable certainty" to the agency action (*United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Ass'n.* v. *McNutt*, 138 F. 2d 116, 120 (C. A. 2)).[6]

---

[6] Thus, the mere fact that petitioner was permitted to intervene in the proceedings below does not confer upon it the right to obtain review of the agency action. In a proceeding like the Ohio Fuel matter, the Commission permits the participation of other natural gas companies, local governmental units and regulatory bodies, and other interested parties. If all of these could be considered "aggrieved," there would result a

To determine whether there was such "probable injury of a substantial character," the court properly looks to the petition for review and its assignment of errors. *Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 219 F. 2d 729 (C. A. 3); *National Broadcasting Co.* v. *Federal Communications Commission, supra*, 132 F. 2d at 548; *Yankee Network, Inc.* v. *Federal Communications Commission, supra*, 107 F. 2d at 224; *Great Western Broadcasting Ass'n* v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 94 F. 2d 244, 248 (C. A. D. C.). The petition for review in the Court of Appeals in this case demonstrates on its face that petitioner is threatened with no such injury by the aspect of the Commission order which it seeks to challenge. That petition is limited in scope, objecting only to the long-term billing commitment feature of the contract-demand rate form authorized by the Commission's order; it finds no fault with either the rate levels set by the order or the contract-demand rate form itself, so long as it is limited to a one-year commitment (see petitioner's principal brief in the court below, pp. 16, 18, 21; and see *supra*, p. 9).

"hopeless clogging of the administrative process by judicial review" (*National Broadcasting Co.* v. *Federal Communications Commission, supra*, 132 F. 2d at 548); accordingly, review is limited to those who can show "probable injury of a substantial character" (*ibid.*). See Federal Power Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C. F. R., Section 1.1 (f) (13); *Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission, supra*, 219 F. 2d at 730; *United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Ass'n.* v. *McNutt, supra*; *National Coal Ass'n.* v. *Federal Power Commission, supra*; *Yankee Network, Inc.* v. *Federal Communications Commission*, 107 F. 2d 212, 215 (C. A. D. C.).

Petitioner alleges that the long-term billing commitment adversely affects it in several ways, none of which, we submit, in any way supports its claim that it is presently aggrieved by the order:—

(*a*) Petitioner alleges, first, that the Commission's order is unlawful because it seeks to assure Ohio Fuel minimum demand revenues over a long term, even though petitioner's gas requirements "might substantially decrease due to loss of business to competitive fuels and technologies" (principal brief in Court of Appeals, p. 13). The injury thus anticipated is purely speculative; petitioner does not complain that the long-term billing commitment will have any immediate unfavorable impact upon it, but only that if the natural gas business becomes a "sick" industry, the long term commitment will result in an inequitable financial burden upon petitioner. There is, of course, no evidence that the natural gas industry faces such a fate in the foreseeable future, nor even an allegation that such a debacle is probable. Petitioner's own expert witness considered the gas business to be one of the more stable businesses in this country (p. 3397 of original transcript). There is no justification for adjusting a rate form to the mere "possibility that unanticipated disaster may come to a presently prosperous and stable industry" (opinion of Court of Appeals in No. 13515, Pet. App. 9a).[7] Only an "imme-

[7] Petitioner's reliance on *Market Street R. Co.* v. *Railroad Comm. of California*, 324 U. S. 548, is plainly without merit. In that case, the Court pointed out that the railway company was "a particularly ailing unit of a generally sick industry" (324 U. S. at 554), whose property had been reduced in value by economic forces beyond the possibility of economic repair,

diately pressing" injury—one now existing, or at least demonstrated to be truly a looming threat—constitutes "aggrievement" entitling a petitioner to judicial review. *Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank*, 333 U. S. 426, 432:

> Thus the Bank seeks a declaration of its rights *if* it should lose its independence, or *if* the Board of Governors should reverse its policy and seek to invoke the condition even though the Bank remains independent and *if* then the Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should not change their policy not to grant deposit insurance to the Bank as a non-member of the Federal Reserve System. The concurrence of these contingent events, necessary for injury to be realized, is too speculative to warrant anticipatory judicial determinations. Courts should avoid passing on questions of public law even short of constitutionality that are not immediately pressing. Many of the same reasons are present which impel them to abstain from adjudicating constitutional claims against a statute before it effectively and presently impinges on such claims.

---

and accordingly that, in fixing its rate base, historical cost, reproduction cost, and prudent investment are not to be considered. As the court below stated with reference to the *Market Street* decision (Pet. App. 8a):

> This holding would not have applied to the ordinary metropolitan street railway company at the turn of the century, when the industry was flourishing and traction stock had gilt edges, on the mere possibility of a drastically depressing economic change such as occurred with the advent of the automobile. The *Market Street* holding has no application, as the opinion shows, to a dynamic industry which is in the midst of phenomenal growth.

Moreover, even if petitioner's economic forebodings rested on a firmer foundation than they in fact do, petitioner still would have little basis at the present time for contesting the Commission's order. As the court below pointed out (Pet. App. 9a–10a), "* * * the Federal Power Commission is empowered continuously to scrutinize the economic situation of companies subject to its regulation, with authority to act in the public interest at any time, and would of course give immediate consideration to any future complaint of injury through changed conditions." Cf. *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U. S. 591, 615.

(*b*) Petitioner also claims it is aggrieved in that the order approving the long-term contract-demand rate form unlawfully changes its gas service agreement with Ohio Fuel "without the necessary finding that said agreement adversely affects the public interest under the Natural Gas Act" (principal brief in Court of Appeals, p. 13). Here, too, the only aggrievement which petitioner would suffer, even if the order were unlawful, "is that which might occur if the presently prosperous natural gas industry should fall upon evil times, with the long-term billing commitment still in effect although the Federal Power Commission had been standing by" (opinion below, Pet. App. 13a). As we have pointed out, this remote possibility is not present aggrievement.

(*c*) Finally, petitioner complains of the fact that the long-term commitment improperly extends to the revenues and assets of petitioner's electric operations (principal brief in Court of Appeals, p. 13). Peti-

tioner's fear that its gas department creditors might reach its electric assets and revenues could easily be alleviated, as the court below pointed out (Pet. App. 10a), "by separately incorporating [its] gas and electric businesses, subject to the approval of local regulatory authorities having jurisdiction; that [it has] not done so is the result of [its] own choice." In any event, this danger, like petitioner's other objections, in no sense constitutes present aggrievement; "the electric revenues and assets will not be called upon by gas creditors unless and until the gas industry suffers the sickness of the Market Street Railway, a contingency too remote and speculative to be the basis of rejecting the long-term billing commitment * * *" (Pet. App. 11a).

(*d*) Petitioner's failure to show that it was aggrieved by the Commission's order precludes it from obtaining review of the procedural aspects of the order, as well as its substantive content. Petitioner contends (Pet. 9–14) that, despite the determination that it was not aggrieved, it is nevertheless entitled to review of its claim that the procedure followed by the Commission in rejecting petitioner's objections to the new rate form did not comply with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The short answer to this contention is that, whether petitioner relies upon Section 19 (b) of the Natural Gas Act or upon Section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act,[*] it is only entitled to judicial review if it shows

[*] Section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U. S. C. 1009, provides in pertinent part:

> Except so far as (1) statutes preclude judicial review

that it is "aggrieved" by the agency action of which he complains. Section 10, "by its own terms, is made inapplicable in so far as * * * statutes [as here] preclude judicial review * * *" (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.*, 348 U. S. 492, 500). In the absence of aggrievement, the court below could not consider any of petitioner's attacks on the order, whether directed at its merits or at its procedural aspects.

2. In any event, the same considerations which demonstrate that petitioner is not really aggrieved also show the soundness of the Commission's order on its merits. Petitioner does not challenge the order as it applies today or so long as the natural gas industry continues in a healthy state; this being so, the remoteness of any possible adverse effect, taken together with petitioner's ever-present right to ask the Commission to review and revise the rate form if conditions do change, indicate that the order is a valid and reasonable one. Similarly, the remoteness of injury to petitioner's electric operations—which could occur only in the event of an unexpected and drastic alteration in conditions—shows that the Commission's order is a proper one.

The petition argues (Pet. 10–11) that the Commission did not make any finding on the relationship of the new rate form to the public interest, but, as the

---

or (2) agency action is by law committed to agency discretion—

(a) *Right of Review.* Any person suffering legal wrong because of any agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by such action within the meaning of any relevant statute, shall be entitled to judicial review thereof.

* * * * *

court below points out (Pet. App. 11a–12a), the fact is that the Commission did make the necessary findings that the old form was no longer in the public interest and the new form was just and reasonable. See the Statement, *supra,* pp. 6–8. Nor is there any substance to the contention (Pet. 11–12, 13) that the Commission did not comply with the Administrative Procedure Act in that it failed to answer petitioner's contentions. The Commission's findings and order are sufficiently detailed and specific, and give the Commission's reasons and grounds for its action. See the Statement, *supra,* pp. 6–8, and the opinion below (Pet. App. 4a–6a).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

J. LEE RANKIN,
Solicitor General.
GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB,
Assistant Attorney General.
PAUL A. SWEENEY,
ROBERT S. GREEN,
Attorneys.

WILLARD W. GATCHELL,
General Counsel,
HOWARD E. WAHRENBROCK,
Solicitor,
Federal Power Commission.

JANUARY 1958.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1958